

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated April 20, 2005. Claims 1 to 24 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,633 (Burgess) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,500 (Lau). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns identifying a licensor computer on a display screen from among a plurality of displayed devices. According to the invention, a licensor computer having a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least one of a data processing apparatus and any other of a plurality of computers. A display of a display screen for the plurality of computers and other devices on the network is controlled such that the licensor computer may be distinguished from one or more of the plurality of computers that receive the predetermined license from the licensor computer on the display screen. Thus, the user can readily determine which device is the licensor computer and which device have received the license by referring to the display screen.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a data processing apparatus that is adapted to communicate data through a network to each of a plurality of computers and a plurality of peripheral devices connected to the network, comprising display means for displaying the plurality of computers and the plurality of peripheral devices as symbol information on a display screen, first discriminating means for discriminating, from the plurality of computers, a licensor computer having a license

server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least one of said data processing apparatus and any other of the plurality of computers, and first control means for controlling said display means to display the licensor computer discriminated by said first discriminating means such that the licensor computer may be distinguished from one or more of the plurality of computers that receive the predetermined license from the licensor computer on the display screen.

Amended independent Claims 5 is an apparatus that includes features substantially corresponding to Claim 1, while Claims 9 and 13 are method claims that substantially correspond to Claims 1 and 5, respectively, and Claims 17 and 21 are computer medium claims that substantially correspond to Claims 1 and 5, respectively.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display of a data processing apparatus so that a licensor computer, discriminated as having a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least one of the data processing apparatus and any other of a plurality of computers, may be distinguished from one or more of the plurality of computers that receive the predetermined license from the licensor computer on the display screen.

The Office Action admits that Burgess fails to disclose discriminating a licensor computer from among a plurality of computers. Accordingly, Burgess also cannot control a display so that the discriminated licensor computer may be distinguished from other computers that receive a license from the licensor computer on a display screen.

Lau is merely seen to disclose determining a position of an object within a hierarchical structure. Objects can be flagged on a display so as to indicate the object's level in the hierarchy. Thus, while Lau may distinguish an object from others on a display, it is not seen disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display of a data processing apparatus so that a licensor computer, discriminated as having a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least one of the data processing apparatus and any other of a plurality of computers, may be distinguished from one or more of the plurality of computers that receive the predetermined license from the licensor computer on the display screen.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, the proposed combination of Burgess and Lau is not believed to have rendered the present invention obvious. Accordingly, amended independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edward A. Kmett', written over a horizontal line.

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 99197v1